

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the reasons that follow.

Claim Objections

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to Claim 26, and indicated that “rotary switch” does not have antecedent basis. Claim 10 has been amended to recite the rotary switch. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the objection to Claim 26 has been overcome.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

On page 3 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected Claims 1-4, 7, 10, 12, 14, 15 and 21-27 as being unpatentable over U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0128191 to Strasser et al. (“Strasser”) and in view of WO Pub. No. 2003/088164 to Wells (“Wells”) under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

The “user interface for receiving inputs from a user” recited in independent Claim 1 (as amended) would not have been obvious in view of Strasser, alone or in any proper combination with Wells under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Strasser alone or in any proper combination with Wells does not disclose, teach or suggest a “user interface for receiving inputs from a user” comprising, in combination with other elements, “a rotary switch formed from the flexible sheet of the interface and configured for twisting relative to the at least one of a system of lights and the electronic display, wherein the rotary switch is configured to be twisted and to create one or more buckle points in the flexible sheet of the interface when twisted, the buckle points detectable by the touch sensitive surface.” To transform the Strasser and Wells into the “user interface for receiving inputs from a user” (as recited in Claim 1) would require still further modification.

The Examiner, on page 11 of the Office Action, acknowledges that “Strasser and Wells are silent regarding buckle points.” However, the Examiner then contends that “it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify teachings of Strasser et al. so to have the rotary switch twist to a maximum point such that a

buckle point is formed, which causes resistance/restriction from any further movement of the rotary switch, in order to indicate to the user that the maximum rotation point has been reached.”

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. The only mention of rotary action in Strasser is in para. [0017] which recites, in its entirety, “The switch 36 may be actuated to indicate a user input selection to the processor-based system 10. Examples of electrical switches include push-button switches, rotary switches and pivoting switches.” Yet further, in Strasser switch 36 is only shown and described as something *separate* from transparent regions 18. See, for example, the Figures of Strasser (Fig. 2 reproduced below).




FIG. 2

By contrast, amended Claim 1 recites, among other elements, that the “rotary switch [is] formed from the flexible sheet of the interface” and that the buckle points are “in the flexible sheet of the interface when twisted.” With respect to rotary switches, Applicants respectfully submit that one reading Strasser would be motivated to provide, at most, a rotary switch that is *structurally separate* from the transparent material. Applicants respectfully submit that one of skill in the art would not have provided the claimed rotary switch without a teaching or motivation. None of the prior art references provide such a teaching or motivation. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the “user interface for receiving inputs from a user” recited in

independent Claim 1, considered as a whole, would not have been obvious in view of Strasser and/or Wells. Therefore, amended Claim 1 is patentable over Strasser in view of Wells. The claims which depend from independent Claim 1 are also patentable. See 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 4.

For many of the same reasons as recited above with respect to Claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that the “user interface for a vehicle” recited in independent Claim 10 (as amended) would not have been obvious in view of Strasser, alone or in any proper combination with Wells under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Strasser alone or in any proper combination with Wells does not disclose, teach or suggest a “user interface for a vehicle” comprising, in combination with other elements, “a rotary switch formed from the flexible sheet of the interface and configured for twisting relative to the display, wherein the rotary switch is configured to be twisted and to create one or more buckle points in the flexible sheet when twisted, the buckle points detectable by the plurality of switches.” To transform the Strasser and Wells into the “user interface for a vehicle” (as recited in Claim 10) would require still further modification. Independent Claim 10, considered as a whole, would not have been obvious in view of Strasser and/or Wells. Therefore, amended Claim 10 is patentable over Strasser in view of Wells. The claims which depend from independent Claim 10 are also patentable. See 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 4.

On page 12 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected Claims 6, 8, 9, and 16 as being unpatentable over Strasser in view of Wells and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,282,464 to Obradovich (“Obradovich”) under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Applicants respectfully submit that Obradovich does not cure the deficiencies noted above with respect to independent Claims 1 and 10 from which Claims 6, 8, 9, and 16 depend. Particularly, a word search reveals that Obradovich is silent on rotary switches. Yet further, Applicants respectfully submit that one of skill in the art would not have been motivated to combine Obradovich with Strasser and Wells. Obradovich relates to a “technique for effectively providing audio information to a vehicle” (see Obradovich at Title). Neither of Strasser and Wells are directed to a similar technology. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Obradovich does not cure the deficiencies of Strasser and Wells for a number of reasons. Claims

6, 8, 9, and 16 are therefore patentable over any proper combination of Strasser, Wells, and Obradovich. Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of Claims 6, 8, 9, and 16 be withdrawn.

On page 14 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected Claims 17-20 as being unpatentable over Strasser in view of Obradovich under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Applicants respectfully submit that the “user interface for a vehicle” recited in independent Claim 17 (as amended) would not have been obvious in view of Strasser, alone or in any proper combination with Obradovich under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Strasser alone or in any proper combination with Obradovich does not disclose, teach or suggest a “user interface for a vehicle” comprising, in combination with other elements, “a rotary switch formed from the material of the interface and configured for twisting relative to the display, wherein the rotary switch is configured to be twisted and to create one or more buckle points in the material when twisted, the buckle points detectable by the plurality of contact regions.” The Examiner acknowledges that Strasser is silent regarding buckle points. Further, Obradovich is silent on rotary switches altogether. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Strasser and Obradovich do not disclose, teach, or suggest the “user interface for a vehicle” as recite in amended Claim 17. To transform Strasser and Obradovich into the “user interface for a vehicle” (as recited in Claim 17) would require still further modification. Independent Claim 17, considered as a whole, would not have been obvious in view of Strasser and/or Obradovich. Therefore, amended Claim 17 is patentable over Strasser in view of Obradovich. The claims which depend from independent Claim 17 are also patentable. See 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 4.

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by the credit card payment instructions in EFS-Web being incorrect or absent, resulting in a rejected or incorrect credit card transaction, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorize payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date February 23, 2010

By / Karl F. Reichenberger /

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 26371
Telephone: (414) 319-7347
Facsimile: (414) 297-4900

Karl F. Reichenberger
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 60,726